

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 4, 2008. Claims 27, 31, 32 and 34-36 were pending in that action. All claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 27 and 31 are amended. Claims 40 and 46 are cancelled. The remaining claims are unchanged.

**It is respectfully pointed out that the amendments to the claims proposed herewith simply amount to a relocation of a single dependent claim into each of the pending independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these issues have already been considered by the Examiner. Therefore, the amendments are appropriate for entry after the Final Office Action. Consideration and entry of the amendments are respectfully requested.**

It is respectfully pointed out that the Summary included with the latest Office Action does not indicate one way or the other whether the drawings filed on September 15, 2003 have been accepted. It would seem that the Examiner unintentionally overlooked checking the “accepted” box. An indication that Applicant’s drawings are accepted is respectfully solicited.

Beginning on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 27-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by an article attributed to Wu (hereinafter referred to as “the Wu reference”). Applicant assumes that this rejection was intended to include all pending claims, namely, claims 27, 31, 32 and 34-46. For reasons that will be discussed in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that these pending claims, at least as amended, are allowable over the cited Wu reference.

With the present response, Applicant has amended claim 27 such that it now includes the limitations of dependent claim 40. Accordingly, dependent claim 40 has been cancelled. Thus, independent claim 27 now limits the claim step of generating a quantitative value to a quantitative value “represents a level of precision which overlapping ambiguous string word type indications were applied in the output.”

In rejecting the claim element that has now been added to independent claim 27, the Examiner points to the Wu reference at page 5, lines 1-3. This passage simply describes how

segmentation ambiguities are resolved in accordance with the Wu processing methods. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of generation of a quantitative value that represents a level of precision which overlapping ambiguous string word type indications have been applied. The Examiner also points to the Wu reference at page 19, lines 1-7. This passage describes generating a variety of statistics none of which have anything to do with quantifying a level of precision with which overlapping ambiguous string word type indications have been applied. All of the statistics generated in accordance with the Wu reference pertain to a precision with which a parsing process has been conducted. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in the passages cited by the Examiner or elsewhere in the Wu reference of application of overlapping ambiguous string word type indications, let alone generation of a quantitative value indicating a precision with which such type indications have been applied.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 27 is in allowable form. Dependent claims 34-39 and 41 are dependent upon independent claim 27 and are believed to be in allowable form at least for the same reasons discussed above in relation to their affiliated independent claim.

With the present response, independent claim 31 has been amended such that it now includes the elements of dependent claim 46. Dependent claim 45 has been cancelled. Accordingly, independent claim 46 now limits the claimed step of comparing to provide a first set of values for each of the plurality of word types to a set of values for a covering ambiguous string word type.

In rejecting the elements that have been added to independent claim 31, the Examiner simply points to the Wu reference at page 19, lines 1-7 and page 5, lines 1-3. As was discussed above in relation to claim 27, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in these passages of application of ambiguous string word types, let alone covering ambiguous string word types. There certainly is no teaching or suggestion of a generation of a set of values for a covering ambiguous string word type as claimed.

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 31 is in allowable form. Dependent claims 42-45 are dependent upon independent claim 31 and are

believed to be in allowable form at least for the same reasons discussed above in relation to their affiliated independent claim.

Applicant invites the Examiner to look closely at the generation of statistics as taught on page 19 of the Wu reference. The word recall statistic has absolutely nothing to do with any level of precision with which ambiguous string word type indications have been applied. The word recall statistic is nothing more than the percentage of words in a reference that are also in a corresponding hypothesis. Neither does word precision have anything to do with quantifying a level of precision with which ambiguous string word type indications have been applied. Word precision represents nothing more than the percentage of words in the hypothesis that are also in the corresponding reference. The so-called F-measure is nothing more than a simple average of precision and recall. The OOV Rate and the OOV Recall Rate statistics also have nothing to do with quantifying a level of precision with which ambiguous string word type indications have been applied. Further, independent claims 27 and 31, as amended, are limited to quantifying specific types of ambiguous string word type indications, namely, overlapping and covering type indications. There certainly is no teaching or suggestion in the cited reference of any quantification of these types of ambiguities. Again, it is emphasized that the issue is not quantifying the frequency with which such ambiguities occur during a parsing process. Instead, the issue is quantifying a precision with which particularly claimed types of ambiguities are labeled in accordance with specifically claimed types of indications. It is respectfully pointed out that independent claims 27 and 31, as amended, are very specifically focused claims.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 27, 31, 32 and 34-36 are in allowable form. Consideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Christopher L. Holt/

Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:rkp